

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER,  
AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING  
COMMAND**



**AF MANUAL 23-220**

**AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND**

**Supplement 1**

**18 APRIL 2002**

**Supply**

**REPORTS OF SURVEY FOR AIR FORCE  
PROPERTY**

---

**NOTICE:** This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at:  
<http://afpubs.hq.af.mil>.

---

OPR: HQ AETC/LGSP (MSgt Angela Lara)  
Supersedes AFMAN 23-220/AETC Sup 1,  
3 March 2000

Certified by: HQ AETC/LGS (Col John Culpepper)  
Pages: 5  
Distribution: F

---

**AFMAN 23-220, 1 July 1996, is supplemented as follows:**

Maintain and dispose of records created as a result of prescribed processes in accordance with AFMAN 37-139, *Records Disposition Schedule* (will become AFMAN 33-322, Volume 4). This publication is not applicable to Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Command units. A bar ( | ) indicates revision from the previous edition.

**SUMMARY OF REVISIONS**

This revision deletes paragraph 11.7. This method may be determined locally.

1.6. AF Form 2519, **All Purpose Checklist**, may be used to create a report of survey (ROS) checklist as a guide to manage the program. See **Attachment 7 (Added)**(AETC) for an example of the kinds of questions that may be included in the ROS checklist. Bases may adjust the checklist to fit their needs.

2.3.12. When a discretionary limitation of liability is exercised, the approving authority will state the rationale for limiting liability in block 14b of DD Form 200, **Financial Liability Investigation of Property Loss**.

4.1.5. This action should be taken immediately upon receipt of the investigating officer's findings and recommendations.

5.2. The ROS program manager will make every effort to enforce established time limits. However, when established time limits are exceeded, the ROS program manager will followup and document each incident. The ROS program manager will elevate all exceeded times, using the chain of command, to ensure timely resolution. Wing commanders are encouraged to post ROS metrics at wing standup.

9.2.8. Only in unusual cases will the approving authority assume the responsibilities of the appointing authority. This action will not be done as a matter of ordinary course.

10.1.1.A.8. The individual should also be given the opportunity to consult with counsel at this stage. The approving authority is responsible for ensuring the individual is notified of findings and recommendations, is informed of the right to consult with counsel, and has a chance to respond to the assessment of financial liability.

11.4.6. Actual cost of repair (AF Form 20, **Repair Cost and Reparable Value Statement**) will be provided (if applicable) in the case file on all appeals sent to MAJCOM.

11.11. The staff office responsible for managing the ROS program within AETC is the Directorate of Logistics, Supply Division, Management and Systems Branch, Procedures and Standardization Section (HQ AETC/LGSPP).

12.2.1.1. The HQ AETC/LG is the approving authority on ROS when the amount of financial liability to be assessed exceeds \$10,000 or when the senior host-base commander is personally involved. The ROS program manager will process the case as usual, including assigning a base ROS number. An investigating officer will conduct an initial investigation. Immediately upon completion, the ROS program manager will forward the report to the AETC program manager for further action.

12.3.2. Authority to take final action on ROS appeals and request for waiver has been delegated to HQ AETC/LG.

13.2.3. In AETC, the appointing authority will not serve as the financial liability officer.

17.6.1. Send the original and one copy of the appeal file (to include all supporting documentation).

17.7. The AETC staff judge advocate will conduct a legal review of the ROS file before action by the final approving authority.

18.3.1. A ROS is not required on GSA vehicles and commercial rental vehicles under Air Force control when damage is caused by natural disaster (hurricane, tornado, etc.).

18.4.3.6. This option cannot be delegated.

**22.13. (Added) Forms Adopted.** DD Form 200, AF Form 20, and AF Form 2519.

### ***1 Attachment (Added)***

7. Report of Survey for Air Force Property Checklist (Added)

**Attachment 7 (Added)****REPORT OF SURVEY FOR AIR FORCE PROPERTY CHECKLIST**

- A7.1. Has the ROS initiating official notified the COMSEC custodian when the ROS involves the loss of COMSEC equipment and supply items? (paragraph 2.3.4)
- A7.2. Has financial assessment been recommended? If so, has a written legal review been obtained? (paragraph 2.3.15)
- A7.3. Was the legal review obtained before forwarding to the approving authority and before the individual was notified of assessment? (paragraph 2.3.15)
- A7.4. Did the initial investigating officer review actions taken by the supervisor to ensure the equipment account was properly inventoried and required paperwork (equipment transfers, ROS, etc.) was initiated before the custodian transferred? (paragraph 2.3.9)
- A7.5. Has a “disinterested” officer been appointed as the investigating officer? (paragraph 4.1.2)
- A7.6. Do the investigating officer and his or her commander know the investigation has become the investigator’s primary duty and he or she is to be relieved of all other duties until the investigation has been completed? (paragraph 4.1.2)
- A7.7. Has the investigating officer answered the following questions: what happened, how, where, and when; who was involved, and was there any evidence of negligence, misconduct, or deliberate unauthorized use or disposition of the property? (paragraph 4.1.3)
- A7.8. Did the investigating officer make findings and recommendations? (paragraph 4.1.4)
- A7.9. Has the ROS been referred to the accountable officer if applicable, and were actions completed within 5 days? (paragraphs 4.1.5., 5.3.3)
- A7.10. If an assessment is recommended has the individual assessed been given the opportunity to refute the findings, either verbally or in writing? (If verbal, have they been documented?) (paragraph 4.1.6)
- A7.11. Was a ROS investigator and a ROS number assigned within 15 days of the date of discovery? (paragraph 5.3.1)
- A7.12. Did the ROS investigator and the responsible officer complete the initiation phase within 30 days? (paragraph 5.3.2)
- A7.13. Has the individual been notified within 5 days after being assessed by the approving authority? (paragraph 6.1.1)
- A7.14. Is the investigating official an officer, noncommissioned officer (master sergeant or above), or a civilian employee in grade GS-7, WG-9, WL-5, or WS-1 or above? (paragraph 7.1.1)
- A7.15. If the investigating official is not senior in rank to the individual being investigated, has the person who appointed the investigating officer advised the appointing authority in writing as to why this was necessary? Has this document been made part of the ROS file as an exhibit? (paragraph 7.1.1)
- A7.16. Has the investigator been briefed on the duties involved with investigating a ROS? (paragraphs 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 4.1.3)

A7.17. Has the wing or installation commander developed procedures that ensure unit commanders document, monitor, and take appropriate corrective action pertaining to property loss, damage, or destruction cases that occur under unusual or recurring circumstances, regardless of the dollar value involved? (paragraph 8.3.5)

A7.18. Has the wing or installation commander delegated approving authority in writing to the group commanders? (paragraph 8.4.1)

A7.19. Has the wing or installation commander delegated in writing the authority for the program manager to approve not processing a ROS if the value is under \$500 and a ROS is not required? (paragraph 8.4.4)

A7.20. Did the approving authority use the discretionary authority outlined in paragraph 8.6? If so, did he or she specify which prerogative under the discretionary limitations of liability? (paragraphs 8.6, 14.1.3)

A7.21. Is the appointing authority designated in writing by the approving authority, and is there more than one appointing authority? (paragraph 9.1)

A7.22. Has the appointing authority been authorized by the approving authority to take final action on a ROS for normal retail type items used at base level when the amount of the loss or damage is less than \$2,000 and no evidence exists of negligence, willful misconduct, or deliberate unauthorized use? (paragraph 9.3.6)

A7.23. Does the appointing authority appoint an investigating officer when the situation warrants, that is, paragraphs 9.3.10.1 and 9.3.10.2? (paragraph 9.3.10)

A7.24. Are trends and potential problem areas being maintained? Is this information also being provided to higher headquarters? (paragraph 11.4.1.1)

A7.25. Have internal operating procedures, checklists, and related documents been prepared? (paragraph 11.4.2)

A7.26. Does the program manager provide assistance and guidance to accountable officers, responsible officers, property custodians, financial liability officers, and the approving authority? (paragraph 11.4.2)

A7.27. Is training conducted as required or requested? (paragraph 11.4.2)

A7.28. Are followups conducted to ensure ROS are processed expeditiously? (paragraph 11.4.5)

A7.29. If situations arise that do not appear to be covered by AFMAN 23-220, does the ROS program manager contact higher headquarters for assistance? (paragraph 11.11.)

A7.30. Who appoints the financial liability officer (FLO)? (paragraph 13.2)

A7.31. Is the DD Form 200 typed? (paragraph 14.1.1)

A7.32. Who develops and issues procedures for preparing and processing voluntary payment documents? (paragraph 14.4.2.4)

A7.33. Is the actual loss to the government computed even if financial liability is limited to 1 month's base pay? (paragraph 15.1.1)

A7.34. If the government makes the property more valuable (after repair) than it was before the damage, is it entitled to the full value of repair? (paragraph 15.1.2.3.2)

- A7.35. Should the amount assessed an individual for repair be an estimated cost or the actual cost? (paragraph 15.1.3)
- A7.36. Are indirect labor and material costs included in repair costs and costing methods? (paragraph 15.1.5)
- A7.37. If damaged property is repaired, is a copy of AF Form 200 included in the ROS file? (paragraph 15.1.7)
- A7.38. If a leather flying jacket is lost, damaged, or destroyed through negligence as determined by the ROS process, has the member been assessed the current stock list price? (paragraph 15.1.10)
- A7.39. What depreciation method is used to determine the loss to the government? (paragraph 15.2.2)
- A7.40. Has the ROS initiator or investigator included a statement indicating the factors considered and the methods by which the depreciation was computed, and has this statement been attached to the file? (paragraph 15.2.3)
- A7.41. Has credit been allowed for salvage? (paragraph 15.4)
- A7.42. Has the member been allowed the opportunity to voluntarily pay for the lost, damaged, or destroyed property? (paragraph 16.1.2)
- A7.43. How long does an individual have to submit an appeal if the amount assessed is less than 1 month's base pay? (paragraph 17.3.1)
- A7.44. How must the appeal be submitted? (paragraph 17.3.1)
- A7.45. Should debt be collected if the individual is separating or resigning before an appeal can be ruled on? (paragraph 17.4.2)
- A7.46. Should a vehicle ROS be processed if it is determined only simple negligence was involved? (paragraph 18.4.1.1)
- A7.47. May the investigation officer use a motor vehicle accident investigation report to determine gross negligence? (paragraph 18.4.3.3)
- A7.48. Does the investigating officer coordinate the vehicle ROS through the responsible officer before submitting the ROS to the appointing authority for determination on whether or not to process the ROS? (paragraphs 18.4.3.5.1, 18.4.3.5.2)
- A7.49. Can an individual be assessed more than 1 month's base pay for loss, damage, or destruction of government housing if the approving authority determines only simple negligence was involved? (paragraph 19.4.2)

JOHN C. CULPEPPER, Colonel, USAF  
Deputy Director of Logistics